

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants previously submitted on June 7, 2007, a response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2007. However, Applicants inadvertently, and without deceptive intent, failed to address the new grounds for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) presented by the Examiner with regard to independent claim 6 and those claims that depend upon it. Applicants respectfully submit the present supplemental response to address the rejections of these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, the aforementioned claims are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected independent claim 6 as anticipated by IBM Disclosure NP9406439 (hereinafter "IBM '439"). Applicants note that claim 6, as amended, requires "simulating the hardware error on the data line by a switching unit attached to an outer surface of one of a plurality of memory circuits on the memory module." The device taught by IBM '439 is described as a "memory interposer" that "is plugged into one of the Single In-Line Memory Module (SIMM) sockets," wherein "[t]he SIMM target for fault injection plugs directly into the memory interposer." Thus, IBM '439 teaches a device that is in between a memory module and a memory module socket. The only contact between the memory interposer and the memory module is at the edge connector of the SIMM. Applicants respectfully submit that such contact cannot be reasonably interpreted to encompass attaching a switching device to an outer surface of a memory circuit on the memory module. IBM '439 thus does not teach or even suggest attaching the switch to an outer surface of one of a plurality of memory circuits on the memory module, and none of the cited art overcomes the deficiencies of IBM '439. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 6, as amended, and all claims that depend upon it, are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/763,693
Amdt. dated June 8, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 7, 2007

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roberto de Leon/

Roberto de Leon
PTO Reg. No. 58,967
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400